

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

May 24, 2018
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Commissioners Bishop, Chirls, Lampe, Marciante,
Woosley, Wu

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioner Teh

STAFF PRESENT: Paula Stevens, Eric Miller, Kristi Oosterveen, Michael
Ingram, Department of Transportation

OTHERS PRESENT: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 6:31 p.m. by Chair Bishop who presided.

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Teh who was excused.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Bishop said he wanted to see included in item 7A a discussion and potential motion on the funding of the transportation TFP that relates to the levy funds, the impact fee funds, and the TIFIA loans, as well as a general discussion and request of the Council to find additional funds in the budget process for CIP and TFP projects. He said he also would like to see added to the agenda *The Equity Proposal for the 2019-2030 Transportation Facilities Plan*, which was emailed to the Commissioners earlier in the day, as part of the review process.

Commissioner Chirls said the equity issue is not a minor issue and the Commissioners first received information on it earlier in the day. He said he certainly had not had enough time to review it or to gain the opinions of the staff. He said he would not stand in the way of discussing the issue, but going forward any Commissioner having anything for the full body to discuss at a meeting should send out relative materials well in advance of the next meeting to allow for a thorough review and comment from staff.

Commissioner Wu said she would prefer to stay on the relatively high level and get some sense of direction before diving into such issues.

Chair Bishop said the equity proposal is essentially what he talked about two weeks ago, at which time he sent out spreadsheets and discussion points.

A motion to add the items as described to the agenda and to approve the agenda was made by Commissioner Wu. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Woosley and the motion carried unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Roderick Beddow, 1313 West Lake Sammamish Parkway SE, spoke in support of funding for the completion of the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project. He said he moved to his current home in the fall of 2001 and soon after began seeing signs calling for residents to attend meetings concerning the Parkway. He said he attended as many as he could and ultimately joined the West Lake Sammamish Association. Things eventually progressed to the point of entering into a three-year development process with the city. After many meetings, much discussion and debate, compromises made and alternatives voted on, an agreed-upon vision was arrived at for the Parkway. That was followed by absolutely nothing for many years. The residents believed things were finally on the way when work on the first segment began, but on completion of that segment there was again nothing for several years. Now there is a need for a new water main in the north end and that is triggering the need to address that segment of the roadway at the same time. He said he figured that his son, who was born in 2003, would be in middle school by the time the Parkway project started. He said he figured his son would be in high school by the time the second part of the project would be started, and in college before the project was completed. He is currently a freshman in high school and according to the 12-year TFP may in fact be starting his own family by the time the project is done, by which time members of the City Council and the Transportation Commission may have died of natural causes. It has been too long and it is time to finish the Parkway.

4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCIL, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Commissioner Woosley said he recently had the opportunity to attend a Sound Transit presentation on the Operations and Maintenance Facility East, which is currently being cleared and graded on 120th Avenue NE. The project is moving forward rapidly and the schedule calls for completing the work by September 2020. Sound Transit intends to put out an RFP for development of the transit-oriented development portion on the southern end of the site.

Commissioner Woosley said the city recently hosted an open house at the GIX facility in the Spring District on the transportation improvements for Bel-Red. The event was well attended.

Commissioner Woosley disclosed that he submitted to the Planning Commission a Land Use Code amendment request that would make bike rentals a permitted use in the city. Currently, the bikeshare program calls for right-of-way use permits, which are exclusive to public property. The code is silent on permitting such things as leasing a stall in a parking lot for bike racks or a space in a commercial building for a bike rental business.

Commissioner Marciante reported that she spoke earlier in the day at a city age conference that was directed mostly to city staff. She said she served as one member of a panel called The Future of Transportation. Also on the panel were representatives from Smart Columbus, Uber and the Seattle Department of Transportation. There was broad agreement among the participants that the future is autonomous, connected, electric and shared. There will be a rapid disruption of the transportation system and a very different type of transportation system driven by new technologies that will allow for sharing rides much more efficiently, ending the trend of owning personal vehicles. It will be a very different transportation system, but it will somehow have to be accommodated within the current infrastructure plan.

Commissioner Lampe said he continues to serve on the Sound Transit Citizens Oversight

Panel. He said the Panel meets twice each month to review various topics of interest to the agency. Most recently the Panel received a presentation on the East Link project and the construction progress being made. He said he also attended a workshop a couple of weeks ago put on by the Sound Transit Board that focused on their long-range planning. It was noted there that the Seattle region currently has the most robust transit expansion program in the nation.

Commissioner Wu said she attended the recent King County Transit Advisory Commission retreat. One of the takeaways was that Seattle is one of the only metropolitan area in the country experiencing a robust increase in transit ridership.

Chair Bishop commented that in reading the minutes of the April 12 Commission meeting he was reminded that the Commission needed to be doing a better job of following Roberts Rules of Order. He said he would try to do better at maintaining order at the meetings, with only one person speaking at a time after having been recognized by the Chair.

5. STAFF REPORTS

Assistant Transportation Director Paula Stevens provided the Commissioners with an invitation to attend an open house and trail walk to be led by Senior Transportation Planner Michael Ingram. The Crossroads trail link will create a connection that is not currently very well formalized. The event is slated for Saturday, June 9.

Ms. Stevens reminded the Commissioners that they would soon be issued iPads and that all materials would be received electronically after September 13. She said the Commissioners would be provided with training on the use of the technology.

Ms. Stevens reminded the Commissioners that the Commission's June 14 meeting would be held at the South Bellevue Community Center, noting that prior to the meeting there will be an open house about the Eastgate Transportation Study at 6:00 p.m. She said the election of Chair and Vice-Chair is slated for the June 14 meeting. The Commission's meeting on June 28 will be back at City Hall and will focus on multimodal LOS.

6. PUBLIC HEARING – None

7. STUDY SESSION

A. 2019-2030 Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP) Workshop

Chair Bishop brought to the table the notion of a Commission recommendation to the City Council about the three major pieces of revenue to the city that have been either amended, increased or added in the last decade. He noted that the transportation impact fees have increased tenfold from \$500/trip to \$5000/trip. The funds are specifically required to flow to capacity improvements needed as a direct result of permitted projects. The levy that was approved by the voters in 2016 specifically added funds to be spent on transportation projects, and the \$100 million TIFIA loan funds by statute are required to be spent on transportation projects.

Commissioner Woosley said he raised the issue in a memo sent out on May 10. The staff provided the Commission with a presentation on where the funds are being spent and how they fit into the budget. He said his memo was in response to the fact that the draft TFP was a significantly lower percentage for transportation than it had been relative to the city's overall

capital programs, but he allowed that the response of staff pointed out how a portion of unallocated funds, future grant awards, and TIFIA debt service costs, when they are factored in, brings the average up to about the same amount. The additional funds are by current city practice supplemental and not intended to supplant revenue streams. He suggested affirming the additional impact fee money, the additional levy money, and the TIFIA loan as supplemental dollars. That should be part of the Commission's communication.

A motion to include in the Commission's communication an affirmation of the fact that the additional impact fee money, the additional levy money and the TIFIA loan funds are supplemental dollars was made by Commissioner Woosley.

Commissioner Chirls asked if the purpose of the motion was due to a concern that the city would take money that otherwise would be used for transportation projects and spend it somewhere else given the additional monies. Commissioner Woosley said that was part of his concern. He said his real concern was that the memo on the seven-year CIP identifies over a billion dollars in unfunded transportation capital projects in the city. More revenues are needed for transportation projects, not less, and the Commission should affirm that the additional revenues will all serve as supplemental revenues.

Commissioner Chirls asked Commissioner Woosley if he was concerned that because the city is in good shape, things will change. He said he heard Commissioner Woosley say that he had been convinced by the staff that transportation funding has been relatively stable and consistent in accord with policy, and he said he assumed Commissioner Woosley was concerned there would be a change, otherwise there would be no need to say anything. Commissioner Woosley said it would be a good thing for the Commission to affirm what it sees as good policy. Commissioner Chirls said if the concern is about the city making a change, the motion would need to be worded differently to the effect of not wanting to see a change made.

Chair Bishop said his sense was that the motion was about supporting the current policy.

Commissioner Wu said she had read the email from Commissioner Woosley and noted that in general she supported the essence of the message, which was that transportation has many demands and there is a need to continue investing accordingly. She stated, however, that she did not support advising the Council to make the current practice a policy.

Commissioner Marciante said she would like to see as many city dollars as possible spent on transportation projects. However, the Commission is not charged with allocating the budget. She said the Commission can certainly inform the Council that it hopes it will give transportation projects as much funding as possible. It is logical that the Commission would like to see as much as possible earmarked for transportation projects, but that is not the Commission's role. She questioned the appropriateness of the Commission giving counsel to the City Council on how money should be allocated.

Commissioner Woosley said there is a difference between giving direction to and making a recommendation to the Council regarding continuation of current policies.

Commissioner Marciante said she could support forwarding a communication to the Council that the Commission is happy with the current way transportation funds are allocated. Such a communication should include the Commission's recognition of the fact that the additional revenues are needed to help bridge the funding gap.

Commissioner Woosley said that would be consistent with his motion. He stated, however, that the Commission has the right to recommend additional funding for transportation projects. The Commission in fact has a history of doing that, most recently in helping to craft the levy amount and allocations. Commissioner Marciante pointed out that Commission was asked to do that.

Chair Bishop clarified that in fact the request to expand the levy did not come from the Commission, rather it had come from Commissioner Woosley and himself directly to specific Councilmembers. The Commission did not take any action on that.

Commissioner Wu asked if the intent of the motion is to seek additional transportation investments from the Council. Chair Bishop said in his mind that was a separate issue from the proposal on the table.

Chair Bishop said the motion on the floor is to forward a statement from the Commission to the Council affirming the current policy of supplementing the base transportation infrastructure money with the additional money that comes from impact fees, levy funds and the TIFIA loan.

Commissioner Chirls said he could support giving a hint that more money would be helpful without actually saying that.

Commissioner Lampe asked if the result of the motion would be a memo to the Council independent of the TFP transmittal memo. Commissioner Woosley suggested incorporating it into the transmittal.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Chirls and it carried unanimously.

Chair Bishop pointed out that the staff presentation that showed \$140 million indicated that the Council will in the next six months decide where to spend the \$56 million that is unallocated. He said the question in his mind was whether or not the Commission should ask the Council to be generous in allocating toward the transportation budget.

Commissioner Marciante said she would phrase it as the Commission wanting the Council to be aware of the significant transportation needs as it considers the next transportation budget.

A motion was made to point out to the Council the shortfall in transportation and the need for transportation funding as the Council considers the next budget allocation. The motion was seconded by Chair Bishop.

Commissioner Woosley said there is language in the memo for the current CIP that specifies the actual amount and asked Commissioner Marciante if she would be willing to include that in the motion. Commissioner Marciante asked where the number comes from and she was told by Commissioner Woosley that the adopted CIP includes a narrative, at the beginning of which it is noted that the city is over a billion dollars short.

Commissioner Wu pointed out that the Commission has not in fact discussed that shortfall number and would be hesitant to refer to it. Commissioner Marciante agreed and said she could see no reason to include a specific amount. It should simply be made clear that there is a significant shortfall that the Commission wants the Council to consider.

Commissioner Chirls said it would be disingenuous of the Commission to say something to

that effect without noting the \$56 million in unallocated funds. The Commission should be clear that its recommendation is in view of that.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Marciante about the pie chart showing the unallocated funds, Implementation Planning Manager Eric Miller explained that the chart is not directly related to the Transportation Facilities Plan, rather it is focused on the early financial outlook for the Capital Investment Program update, the city's seven-year capital budget plan. It is not really an apples-to-apples comparison in regard to the TFP conversation. The vast majority of those funds sit in the 2024-2025 budget, which clearly has not yet been adopted. He stressed that \$12 million of the \$56 million total is already dedicated to transportation and will be additive to the 36 percent.

Commissioner Marciante amended her motion to add that the Commission understands there are currently unallocated funds that will need to be allocated in the next budget and that the Commission wants to make the Council aware of the significant need for transportation capital. Chair Bishop agreed to the amendment.

Commissioner Chirls said he would prefer to see wording along the lines of "in recognition of the large gap between the projected transportation needs and actual monies available."

Mr. Miller asked if the intent of the Commission was to tie the motion to the TFP transmittal or forward it as a separate item. Chair Bishop said he wanted embodied in the TFP/CIP issue.

Commissioner Woosley agreed with the approach recommended by Commissioner Marciante to be general and gracious. He said the question is how much the shortfall is. There is an unfunded column in the TFP that adds up to \$1.1 billion. Chair Bishop said he would not want to see that number used.

Chair Bishop said the motion on the table was to communicate to the Council a request to allocate additional revenue from available funds to supplement the transportation program.

Ms. Stevens offered to have staff develop actual language for the Commission to consider at the meeting on June 14.

The motion carried unanimously.

Senior Transportation Planner Michael Ingram noted that a summary of the budget survey report had been included in the April 26 memo from staff to the Commission. At that point, staff did not have access to the whole document, and the relevant piece staff did not have related to the special topic on transportation. With congestion understood to be one of the biggest concerns of citizens, the question was asked what should be done about it. Four strategies were offered and people were asked about the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with them. Through the various cycles, what has consistently been seen as the top preferred strategy is working with regional transit agencies to improve transit services, followed by encouraging people to choose alternative transportation modes, work with the state to widen highways, and widen major city roads.

Commissioner Chirls said he is familiar with survey methodologies and pointed out that the percentage of people in the strongly agree area relative to the other percentages is very important. When a high number is seen in the strongly agree category, it has greater validity in that it expresses what people feel strongly about. That is particularly true in Northwest culture.

Commissioner Marciante agreed and pointed out that the percentage in the disagree category relative to widening city roads is also very important. She noted that over a third of the respondents were strongly against that option.

Commissioner Woosley commented that the most effective way of reducing congestion is to expand the highways to accommodate more people. The vast majority of trips utilize the highways as well as city streets. The city's adopted Transit Master Plan shows the mode splits which represent the reality of the real travel demands currently and into the future.

Mr. Ingram said the key things the Comprehensive Plan transportation vision speaks to are reliability, predictability, safety and mobility options. The research indicates people particularly value reliability and predictability, regardless of how long it will take them to get to their destination. The Comprehensive Plan also spells out level of service standards for vehicular travel, though it does not yet have level of service standards for other modes of travel. The standards differ by area, with less congestion allowed in residential areas and more in commercial areas. Currently the city is compliant with the established standards. The concurrency report compiled annually looks out six years at all the development in the pipeline and the projects expected to be on the ground, and the outlook is that the city will continue to remain in compliance with the standards. During the environmental phase of the TFP update, the 2030 horizon will be looked at. He said the staff recommendation relative to the TFP is expected to uphold the standards.

Continuing, Mr. Ingram said there is a policy guidance for achieving progress on pedestrian facilities, specifically that 25 miles of new sidewalks along arterials is to be achieved within ten years, or about 2.5 miles of new sidewalks annually. The actual pace currently is about half of that but the supplemental levy funds will likely improve the trend.

As for the bicycle targets, Mr. Ingram said the focus is on creating continuous connected corridors. Five east-west and six north-south corridors have been identified and currently one of the corridors has been completed. The policy guidance is to have four corridors complete by 2019. There is also policy guidance to complete one east-west and one north-south corridor through the downtown by 2015, but that goal was not accomplished.

Commissioner Woosley asked about the bicycle facility between 145th Place SE across to the Lake Hills Shopping Center. Mr. Ingram said there was a process undertaken for determining the priority bicycle corridors. The Lake Hills Connector corridor was not deemed to be a priority corridor.

Mr. Ingram explained that the Metro Connects plan aligns with the Transit Master Plan in many ways. Bellevue's plan identifies priority transit corridors, and Metro's plan identifies Rapid Ride routes, two of which are in Bellevue. What is new is that Metro now has some revenues to bring to the table for capital improvements. The staff recommendation includes placing \$4 million in a reserve fund to be available for allocation to high-priority projects that will benefit or support transit service or facilities. The amount, while without any real science, is enough to feel significant and to show Metro the city has an interest in working with them.

Commissioner Woosley said it was his understanding that Metro has an obligation to install covered bus stops where there is a certain volume of riders. He pointed out that Bellevue receives 16 percent of Metro's service hours and pays for 34 percent of them. He asked what kind of projects the reserve fund dollars would address. Mr. Ingram said the interests of both

Metro and Bellevue is how to move transit efficiently along the priority corridors. It will come down to look at where transit is moving slowly and projects that could improve that. There is a clear policy basis for implementing infrastructure to support reliable transit arrival and travel times along the Frequent Transit Network, and for advocating for transit service enhancements paired with a city commitment to implement transit-supportive infrastructure.

Commissioner Chirls agreed that \$4 million is a significant amount. He asked what the city would be forced to pay for that Sound Transit would not have to do given their incentives to move the buses more efficiently, lowering their costs and increasing the likelihood of more ridership. Mr. Ingram said there are costs on both sides in terms of project development and review. If there is a signal operations element, it is city staff that does that work. He said he could see situations in which the transit agency would agree to pay the capital costs of a project provided the city pays the cost of any signal adjustments. Having a reserve of funds to pay those city costs could be helpful.

Commissioner Wu commented that King County Metro is transitioning from being a division in the Department of Transportation to becoming its own separate department with an aggressive set of goals. Part of their strategy will be work with Sound Transit and with other transit agencies and local jurisdictions. There will be many opportunities for partnerships. Metro is responsible for putting in bus stops, but the city can do various things that will improve access and transit travel times. Seattle sees transit as the answer to congestion problems and as such has many CIP projects on the books that will facilitate transit.

Chair Bishop referred to his memo titled *The Equity Proposal for the 2019-2030 Transportation Facilities Plan*. He said there were four principles in the memo: 1) solving Bellevue's biggest problem per the budget and business survey; 2) fairly allocating investments by how people travel in the city; 3) fully disclosing the individual modal costs associated with various projects; and 4) creating a balance of resource allocation to travel patterns per adopted city plans. To the budget survey question asking what if anything is the biggest problem facing Bellevue that the city should do something about over the next two years, 44 percent of the respondents in the scientific survey indicated traffic. Too much growth and congestion was third on the list at 11 percent, and public transportation was fifth at seven percent. Survey respondents were also asked to rate 39 attributes or services the city provides in terms of importance and satisfaction, and downtown traffic had the second lowest satisfaction score and was above average importance. Bikeways and sidewalks were listed as being in the below average importance quadrant. Building and widening city streets received a higher importance rating than bicycle and sidewalk facilities.

Continuing, Chair Bishop commented that the BKR travel forecasting model includes very aggressive assumptions that increase transit ridership. He said at the time the projections were made he challenged them as being too aggressive at 7.1 percent of the total of 1.2 million daily person trips. The projected 2030 mode split is for 82 percent of the daily person trips to occur by car. With regard to full disclosure relative to project costs by mode, he noted that every arterial project includes sidewalks and bike paths that add up to 20 percent of the total project cost. That needs to be acknowledged. Taking that into account, 26 percent of the dollars in the staff proposal are allocated to ped/bike facilities, and 18 percent is allocated to transit.

Chair Bishop said the 2030 mode split is listed as 82 percent vehicular, 11 percent ped/bike and seven percent transit. He said under his equity proposal, he would allocate 67 percent to vehicular, 18 percent to ped/bike and 15 percent to transit. The staff proposal is to allocate 56 percent to vehicular, 26 percent to ped/bike and 18 percent to transit. The amount of money

being spent on ped/bike facilities in regular projects, which totals \$13.3 million should be acknowledged. That funding should be taken out of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Implementation Initiative reserve account, leaving \$8.8 million in that account. The Bellevue Way South HOV lane is a transit project and the \$4 million in transit funds should be allocated to that project, which combined would add up to \$17.3 million. He said his proposal would open the opportunity to provide funding for other high-priority projects on the list, specifically an additional \$4 million for TFP-260, 120th Avenue NE Phase 4; TFP-263, NE 8th and 148th Avenue NE at \$8.3 million; and the NE 6th Street subsurface arterial at \$600,000.

Chair Bishop commented that staff had recommended fully funding the construction of the Eastgate projects out of levy funds. He suggested that is not in line with what the levy is for, which is to bring projects forward and keyed up ready for funding from the regular budget or grants.

Commissioner Chirls pointed out that toward the end of 2017 the Commission voted on some priorities and handed them off to the staff. Since then the staff have been spending time applying those priorities to the projects on the list. Their resulting recommendations are based on the voted priorities. He said he felt that the proposal of Chair Bishop was an attempt to re-litigate that vote. What that amounts to is the tyranny of the minority and an attempt to act as if the vote never occurred. It is tantamount to not being a Commission but rather just a collection of individuals. Even framed as an issue of equity, there is no reason to re-litigate the vote. A second issue is that while dissatisfaction with traffic is one thing, how to solve the problems of traffic is an entirely different issue. The survey is clear that people want to see the traffic issue solved in certain ways. One way is to work with transit, and to work on alternative means of travel. As has been shown in places like Copenhagen, Amsterdam, London, Vancouver, BC and Portland, where there are alternatives among which people can choose to leave behind their cars, they do just that. The travel numbers do not assume a significant infrastructure exists. It does assume more will exist than currently exists, but it does not assume the priorities voted on by the Commission.

Commissioner Chirls said he was ready to put a motion on the floor, but Chair Bishop stopped him and said it was not the right time for a motion. Commissioners Wu and Marciante argued that Commissioners had the right to make a motion at any time.

A motion to vote on the staff proposal and to not consider a new proposal that implies a different set of priorities was made by Commissioner Chirls. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marciante.

Chair Bishop suggested his proposal in fact precisely follows the vote of the Commission in late 2017. The Commission worked through the scoring system and came up with a list of projects. Staff undertook the process of scoring and giving numbers to the projects. The thinking at the time was that the scoring is only one factor and that the Commission was free to choose what the priorities should be regardless of the scoring outcomes. He pointed out, however, that all of the projects he was talking about scored high and above the line, thus his equity proposal did not in any way violate the previous vote.

Commissioner Marciante noted her support for the comments made by Commissioner Chirls relative to the way the information was being presented and how it makes assumptions that are not in the survey results. She agreed with the need to deal with downtown traffic, but stated that there are very specific policy ways for how to do that, including making sure transit works well, and offering alternative modes. She said the methodology proposed by Chair Bishop was

far different from what the staff recommended relative to allocating to projects a percentage according to what he feels about how the budget elements of the projects break out. The transportation system is integrated and comprehensive and the Commission should not seek to break down each project by percentage transit or ped/bike. That is not how the system works and is just what the Commission seeks to avoid in building sidewalks that do not connect to anything. The city has three different programs and plans, namely capacity building for vehicles, ped/bike as a mode of travel, and transit. If the mode split does not change going forward, it will be the fault of the Commission by way of not investing in an integrated infrastructure system that can serve a continuous mode of travel from Point A to Point B. The underlying methodology for the equity proposal is not clear and is not aligned with the need for a comprehensive and networked transportation system. She disagreed with the proposal to reallocate \$4 million as proposed; saying the HOV lane, which will improve capacity, as just a transit project does not mean \$4 million of transit dollars should be reallocated to that one project. The benefits of the Bellevue Way HOV project go far behind transit only, and thus the project simply cannot be called just a transit project. The transit reserve is intended to facilitate the city working with transit agencies; it is not intended to serve as a way to battle with the transit agencies and drawing lines of where their work stops and where the city's work stops. The citizens want to travel in an integrated system, and that will require coordinating among all of the agencies. The proposal of Chair Bishop will result in policy decisions, and jiggering the numbers and playing with the math, which is not the way policy decisions should be made.

Chair Bishop responded by saying what he was attempting to allocate the scarce resources to those transportation improvements that work. The things that work for the 82 percent of the people who drive cars are things that make cars work better. He said he understood that there are other positions, and that it was appropriate to have the discussion concerning those other positions. He said he, however, would continue to advocate for roads because 82 percent of the daily person trips in 2030 will be by car. People are really upset about traffic, and making bike lanes does not help traffic. Resources are scarce and it does not make sense to apply three times as much toward transit and three times as much toward ped/bike improvements; it is not an equitable approach.

Commissioner Wu agreed that the discussion was focused on policy. She pointed out that staff had provided a memo in which the vision of the Council was outlined. The Council vision is the Commission's policy direction to follow until such time as it is updated. Over the years in the United States the focus has been on building roadway capacity, and when congestion occurred, there were calls for more capacity. As it turns out, that additional capacity has not solved the congestion problem. Transportation planning is shifting toward a multimodal approach. Microsoft chose to invest heavily in 36th Street across SR-520. The roadway has only one lane in each direction but also has very wide sidewalks and a wide landscape buffer. Microsoft also invested in a ped/bike bridge over SR-520, all in an effort to attract and retain its workforce. Bellevue should take note of those trends. She said Chair Bishop is a seasoned traffic engineer and that she had no doubts about the validity of the methodology in some ways, but the approach is driving toward a policy direction that shifts away from the Council vision and the Comprehensive Plan policies.

Chair Bishop responded that he is just nuancing where we are allocating the money. Council policy is to shore up these alternative modes and the alternative proposal shores up the alternative modes significantly though not quite as significantly as the staff proposal does. How we allocate the money is the important conversation of the Commission. In the end, what the Commission sends to the Council will only be a recommendation and the Council will be free to accept it or reject it.

Commissioner Woosley asked Chair Bishop if his proposal actually would add projects to the list. Chair Bishop said it added one project to the list and added money to two others. Commissioner Woosley said that simply represents a reallocation of funding over the 12 years. He said he agreed with Chair Bishop that there should be equity in the allocation of funds according to the ways in which people move. There is currently an inequitable allocation to the vast majority of people. In terms of trying to change people's behavior through transportation infrastructure investments, he agrees that the bike network is not complete and thus it cannot be known what actual utilization will be until the system is completed. Even so, if the number of bike trips could be tripled, it would still represent a very small portion of the overall trips. There are decades of evidence on transit investments, which has increased over the years from one-third of the transportation resources to well over two-thirds, yet the percentage of trips by transit remains at eight percent. The Council's three-year priorities relative to transportation and mobility call for continuing to execute the city's transportation capital plans, and calls for advocating with the state and regional agencies for acceleration of the I-405 master plan and the completion of SR-520, which are capacity projects. The Council priorities are clearly in line with the proposal of Chair Bishop. The Transit Master Plan shows what the assumptions are. The assumptions are highly controversial and everyone who spoke at the public hearing opposed using them because they overstate the likely transit ridership. It makes sense to allocate resources based on how the citizens move currently and how they will be moving in the future. By 2030, the missing connections are assumed to be completed, including the north-south and east-west bike lanes and the additional transit facilities. Finally, Microsoft has an agreement with the city that prohibits expansion unless it provides for alternative modes of travel. They are moving to double the size of the campus and that is the real driving factor behind their investments in non-SOV facilities and their support of ST-3. For the good of the order it's important to understand that requirement. The more disproportionate the transportation investments by the city, the higher the impact fees will go because they are required to address the real mobility demands. Moving toward a more equitable allocation of resources will improve the city's economic competitiveness and will facilitate increase in the city's housing supply. The farther disconnected this is from how people actually will be moving, the worse the problem becomes. Moving toward a more equitable allocation of resources improves our economic competitiveness and increases our housing supply and reduces the cost when housing gets built.

Commissioner Lampe said there is a clear need for more money to address the city's transportation issues. He said his hat was off to Chair Bishop and Commissioner Woosley for their work on the transportation levy. He praised staff for their work on the TFP. The Commission's prior discussions about funding for Bellevue Way and increased funding for West Lake Sammamish Parkway represent good moves. With regard to the Chair's proposal, he said he struggled with it in light of the fact that the ped/bike plan was approved in 2009 and the city is way behind where it should be in achieving its goals in a timely fashion. It comes down to policy direction provided by the Council. He said he was leaning toward the staff recommendation.

Commissioner Woosley agreed that the goals in the adopted ped/bike plan need to be met. He reminded the Commissioners that he and Chair Bishop had worked through the numbers and concluded that it would cost about \$2 million per year to get things back on track. The Commission ultimately recommended \$6.8 million overall, but when it got to the Council, the decision was made to provide no funding at all. Fortunately, passage of the levy has provided some of the needed funds, but there was zero in the Council budget, so he thinks the Transportation Commission overshot. He said the question is what it would take to meet the

Pedestrian and Bicycle Implementation Initiative goals rather than have a reserve account. He suggests the Commission recommend an amount that it would take to meet the PBII goals, whatever that is. We do have a plan and we are behind, so let's get it done. He does not think the Commission should go so far beyond what's needed that it jeopardizes other projects that are more urgent.

Chair Bishop said he worked with staff when the Pedestrian and Bicycle Implementation Initiative first came up to determine what it would take to get the two north-south and two east-west bike routes, plus other things. What it came down to after six months of discussions was the city could achieve its goals with \$2 million per year. By spending another \$4 million a lot of other connections throughout the city could be provided. The Commission recommended \$6.8 million but the Council ultimately recommended zero funding.

Commissioner Chirls called a point of order regarding the Chair's response, pointing out that Chair Bishop had begun the meeting with a call to more closely follow Roberts Rules of Order. He said the statement just made exactly mirrored the statement made by Commissioner Woosley, contrary to the rules.

With regard to the Pedestrian and Bicycle Implementation Initiative and transit, Commissioner Wu said the Commission did not have good estimates and a good plan for the reserve accounts. Staff are working on projects, but more staff time is needed to determine exactly how to use the reserve funds. She stated that her observation is that the reserves will help, but they are far from adequate to get us to where we need to be. For example, the goal is to provide 25 miles of new sidewalks, but only one mile has been added over the last several years. What's needed is far greater than 25 miles. Without good sidewalks people will not feel comfortable or safe when walking. Taking money from the reserves doesn't help achieve the alternative transportation policy direction. King County Metro has a hugely aggressive plan and performance goals that the leadership needs to deliver. The fact is that \$330,000 per year in the current transportation world does not go very far and is far from adequate. The Commission needs to deliver on projects that have been ranked high.

In answer to Commissioner Woosley's question about the appropriate time to identify specific projects for discussion, Chair Bishop said this would be the appropriate time.

Commissioner Woosley called attention to the need for a correction to TFP-242, the Bellevue Way HOV lane project, and noted that previous discussion at the Commission level led to separating the project into three segments A, B and C. He said the direction given to staff was to have three separate projects, but in the draft TFP project list only two are listed, with B and C listed together. Capital Facilities Planning and Programming Administrator Kristi Oosterveen reminded him that at the Commission's meeting on May 10 the Commission voted on the funding for Segment A and voted to combine Segments B and C and establish a \$300,000 placeholder for the two together. Commissioner Woosley said it was his recollection that Segment A from the park and ride to the Winters House was to be postponed. Segment B extends the HOV up 112th Avenue SE, while Segment C, extending from 108th Avenue SE to 112th Avenue SE on Bellevue Way, was open to different design options beyond the HOV lane. The Commission specifically discussed including full-length left-turns to reduce congestion and improve the throughput of Bellevue Way. He said he wanted that memorialized somewhere in the TFP. Ms. Oosterveen said the TFP project location column simply identifies project locations and does not include project descriptions. The direction of the Commission has not been lost.

Commissioner Woosley said he wanted to discuss TFP-260, Stage 4 of 120th Avenue NE. Chair Bishop responded that the project is already on the table for discussion, and asked if any other Commissioners had projects for discussion.

Commissioner Wu asked about TFP-158, SE 16th Street. Chair Bishop pointed out that the Commission had previously voted to remove the project from the list. He did not want to take the time to rehash a vote that had been taken at a previous meeting. He sees no reason to revisit a previous vote. Ms. Stevens said the issue could be brought to the table again if the Commission voted to rescind the previous action. Chair Bishop concurred and added that until there is a vote to rescind, no further discussion is appropriate. Commissioner Wu moved to rescind the previous Commission vote to remove TFP-158 from the list. Chair Bishop stated that because there was a motion on the floor, it would not be appropriate to make another motion.

Mr. Miller clarified that the staff recommendation includes TFP-158, but the Commission recommendation does not.

Commissioner Woosley noted that changes to other projects that were voted by the Commission, including Bellevue Way, were reflected in the staff recommendation. The Commission's action to delete TFP-158 should also be reflected in the staff recommendation. Ms. Oosterveen clarified that keeping the project on the list would continue to be part of the staff recommendation.

Commissioner Chirls said his motion to approve the staff recommendation assumed the Commission's prior vote to delete TFP-158 was part of the staff recommendation.

A motion to change the motion on the floor to approve the staff recommendation, reflecting the Commission's prior vote in regard to TFP-158, was made by Commissioner Chirls.

Commissioner Marciante said she would not accept the amended motion.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lampe, but Mr. Miller pointed out that the person who seconded the original motion would need to agree to amend the motion, and that another person could not second a motion to amend.

A motion to rescind the previous vote on TFP-158 was made by Commissioner Wu. Chair Bishop ruled the motion out of order. Commissioner Wu asked to be informed when she could make the motion.

Chair Bishop reviewed the projects on the list to be discussed. He said they were TFP-246, 150th Avenue SE to reflect that a portion of the money should come out of the levy funds; TFP-195, 150th Avenue SE, to reflect that a portion of the money should come out the levy funds; TFP-263, 148th Avenue NE/NE 8th Street, to increase the funding from \$300,000 to \$8.6 million; TFP-260, 120th Avenue NE Stage 4 to increase the funding from \$2 million to \$6 million; TIP, NE 6th Street subsurface arterial, to move above the line and increase the funding from \$300,000 to \$600,000. He stressed that TFP-158, SE 16th Street, was not on the list to be discussed because the Commission had already dealt with it.

Commissioner Wu reiterated that she was waiting to be told when she could make a motion to rescind the previous vote regarding TFP-158. Chair Bishop said she could not do so until the motion on the floor was acted on.

Commissioner Marciante said she was under the impression that Commissioner Chirls had withdrawn his motion. Commissioner Chirls clarified that he had in fact not withdrawn his motion, rather he had revised it.

Commissioner Wu said she would support the motion and then make her motion to rescind the vote on TFP-158. Commissioner Chirls pointed out that if his motion were to succeed, it would then be necessary to rescind it in order to act on TFP-158. Commissioner Wu stated that she was confused, but she was following direction.

Commissioner Chirls withdrew his motion.

A motion to rescind the prior vote on TFP-158, SE 16th Street, was made by Commissioner Wu. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marciante.

Commissioner Lampe said the Commission had received quite a lot of public comment regarding the project. Many who live in the area are not in favor of it. He said he would not support rescinding the prior vote.

Commissioner Chirls agreed. He said while he personally did not know a lot about the area, he did know that a lot of people from the community made it clear they do not want the project, which is why he voted to remove it.

Commissioner Marciante said she regularly commutes on SE 16th Street. It is part of a priority ped/bike corridor. The issue of the sidewalk has been convoluted with the Puget Sound Energy powerline project. There was engineering done by the city to accommodate Puget Sound Energy placing their poles out of the way of the sidewalk or the bike lane. Somehow, local residents came to believe that the engineering work was in regard to the poles themselves, and their thinking was that the powerline project would get built if the sidewalk got built. Chair Bishop interjected that this was speculation. Commissioner Marciante responded that she is merely relaying her understanding of the issue. She continued by stating that the powerline project and the sidewalk project do not have any relation to each other. The action taken by the Commission to delete the project has the effect of not constructing a sidewalk along a major arterial in an area that has three schools. She has spoken with parents who are concerned about this and who can't attend the meeting. Some have called, emailed and written to comment. The project is important and should be included on the TFP project list.

Chair Bishop asked if there was any new information that would support rescinding the previous vote.

Mr. Miller disclosed information that came from the Mayor to the City Manager to the Department of Transportation Director and to himself and the staff member in the Department of Development Services who issues the permits under which the powerline project would be constructed. The powerline project has been through the conditional use process, which involves a public hearing, and the Hearing Examiner made specific recommendations on the topic that turned into conditions in the conditional use permit. He said the direction from the Mayor is for staff to provide a full explanation of the relationship between the powerline project and TFP-158 in a memorandum to the Commission and to forward the memorandum to the Council ahead of the Council's June 4 meeting. The memo, which has not yet been drafted, will not relate to whether TFP-158 is a good project or not; the Commission's conversation about that should continue.

Commissioner Woosley agreed that the Puget Sound Energy project is separate from TFP-158. The powerline project only seeks to replace poles that are already in place, so the conversation has been muddled. There is an existing pedestrian pathway and a bike lane on the north side of the roadway, though the bike lane is not complete. There are people for and against anything being done, including the powerline replacement project that is a separate issue. He said he saw no new information regarding TFP-158.

Commissioner Wu allowed that several from the community came to a Commission meeting to speak against TFP-158, but none of them gave a reason for being against the project. She said that is what caused her concern after the last vote and was why she brought this forward.

Commissioner Chirls commented that while the staff was aware of all the communications from the community, he as a Commissioner had the benefit of only hearing from those who attended past Commission meetings and offered testimony. He asked staff to characterize the community input. Ms. Oosterveen said she had received letters, emails and phone calls from parents in the neighborhood, many of whom actually do walk in the neighborhood who would like to have safer connections to be able to get to the grocery store and the schools. The portion of sidewalk between 156th Avenue SE and 154th Avenue SE was voted on as part of the Neighborhood Enhancement Program and was funded by that program. The Neighborhood Enhancement Program is not intended to provide only small blocks at a time that do not finish a connection, and of course the Neighborhood Enhancement Program does not have the budget to build the entire missing section from 148th Avenue SE to 154th Avenue SE. The segment is also a candidate on the Neighborhood Sidewalk Program list and it scores well under the new framework. The majority of the communications received have been in favor of having ped/bike facilities in the area for their families and for their kids to get around safely.

Chair Bishop said for the last four years he has had a person elected by the community coming to him asking to have the project deleted. The Commission previously discussed the issues and voted solidly to remove the project from the list.

The motion failed with Commissioners Marciante and Wu voting yes, and Chair Bishop and Commissioners Chirls, Woosley and Lampe voting no.

A motion to accept the staff recommendation, excluding TFP-158, was made by Commissioner Chirls. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lampe.

Commissioner Woosley said he was concerned the city would be way behind in regard to Phase 4 of the 120th Avenue NE project. He pointed out that substantial completion of the Operations and Maintenance Facility East for Sound Transit was scheduled for September 2020. REI is developing its global headquarters in the Spring District on the other side of the street. The Bellevue School District owns a site for a school in the area, and there is a major property on the market for redevelopment. At the rate proposed, the final section of 120th Avenue NE will remain a two-lane road with no curb, gutter, sidewalk or bike lanes as the area redevelops. A way should be found to fund the project and have it complete in a timely fashion.

Chair Bishop noted that there is a million dollars in the CIP for the Phase 4 section of 120th Avenue NE, and under the staff recommendation \$2 million more would be added for a total of \$3 million to be used for design. He asked if that level of funding was sufficient to complete the design work. He also asked if Sound Transit is required under the terms of its permit with

the city to build to city standards along its section of the right-of-way. Mr. Miller said in the opinion of the staff, \$3 million is enough for the design work. Based on the Memorandum of Understanding between Sound Transit and the city of Bellevue, Sound Transit is not required to do frontage improvements. Sound Transit will construct an interim pathway along its frontage, though it will not be on a public easement or right-of-way.

A motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes was made by Commissioner Woosley. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lampe and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Bishop said it was his understanding that it would cost between \$19 million and \$30 million to build out the Phase 4 section, which the city would have to cover. Mr. Miller said the cost will depend on the ultimate roadway cross-section.

Commissioner Woosley noted that there is a transit-oriented development component on 6.5 acres of the Operations and Maintenance Facility East site that Sound Transit will essentially surplus and then put out an RFP to develop it with residential, commercial and some retail. For planning purposes a significant portion of the frontage will have nothing to do with the Operations and Maintenance Facility East. He suggested the city should have plans in place so it can be assured the transit-oriented development will be compatible with the Phase 4 design. Some level of funding will be needed to accomplish that. Any developer who responds to an RFP will need to know where that frontage is and any contribution that may be required of them.

Commissioner Marciante asked if a vote by the Commission to increase the funding as suggested would mean the additional funds would be immediately available. Mr. Miller reiterated that there is \$1 million in the adopted CIP. That is an amount sufficient to determine answers to some of the questions, but it is not enough to complete a full design of the project.

Chair Bishop suggested that Commissioner Woosley make a specific amendment to the motion related to what he is talking about, including an associated dollar amount.

Commissioner Marciante said it was her understanding that simply adding funding to the TFP would not make additional dollars immediately available for the project.

Commissioner Woosley offered that the source could be the Bellevue Way project of \$22 million. Commissioner Marciante called a point of order, stating that this is not a TFP matter.

Chair Bishop said the additional funds would need to be approved in the CIP, which will be updated later in the year.

Commissioner Lampe pointed out that if funds are added to the 120th Avenue NE project, they will need to be taken away from some other project.

Commissioner Woosley stated he understands that the CIP process is where this should be further discussed, but he hopes there is a way to flag this in the Commission's communication.

Commissioner Marciante called a point of order again, stating that there isn't necessarily disagreement, but what she understands is that Commissioner Woosley's comments aren't relevant to the TFP conversation.

Chair Bishop stated that the Commission is not going to change the list regarding Phase 4 of

the 120th Ave NE project.

Chair Bishop moved to amend the main motion to force a vote on his proposal as follows: approve the staff proposal with the exception of SE 16th Street and to increase funding for TFP-260 by \$4 million, to increase the funding for TFP-263 by \$8.3 million, to bring the NE 6th Street subsurface arterial project above the line at \$600,000, to reassign \$4.4 million of funds for TFP-246, TFP-195, TFP-263, and CTPL-41 to the Neighborhood Congestion Reserve Account using non-levy funds for the construction of the projects, and to take the money out of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Implementation Initiative reserve account in the amount of \$13.3 million and out of the Transit Master Plan reserve account in the amount of \$4 million.

Commissioner Chirls called a point of order, stating that the Commission had not yet voted on his motion, so a new motion could not be made until his motion had not been voted on. Chair Bishop replied that the point of order was not well taken and that Commissioner Chirls was not correct because an amendment to the motion was procedurally correct. The Commission could override his ruling if they choose.

As a point of order, Commissioner Woosley said it was his understanding that when there is a motion made to amend a motion, the maker of the original motion must accept the amendment. Chair Bishop replied that this is not correct. That would be a friendly amendment.

As an additional point of order, Commissioner Woosley asked if the proposed motion to amend the motion on the floor was proper. Chair Bishop ruled his motion to amend the motion to be in order. Again, the Commission could overrule him if they choose.

As a point of order, Commissioner Marciante asked how the Commission could overrule the Chair's decision that the motion to amend the motion was in order. Chair Bishop said the process involves a member of the body challenging the Chair, thus stimulating a new discussion. The challenge requires a majority vote.

The challenge to overrule the Chair failed with Commissioners Marciante, Wu and Chirls voting yes, and Chair Bishop and Commissioners Lampe and Woosley voting no.

The motion to amend the motion was seconded by Commissioner Woosley. The motion failed with Chair Bishop and Commissioner Woosley voting yes, and Commissioners Chirls, Marciante, Wu and Lampe voting no.

The main motion to accept the staff recommendation, excluding TFP-158, carried with Commissioners Chirls, Marciante, Lampe and Wu voting yes, and Chair Bishop and Commissioner Woosley voting no.

Chair Bishop asked to have his equity report attached to the transmittal memo and forwarded to the Council as a minority report from he and Commissioner Woosley. Ms. Stevens pointed out that the staff have been directed by the Council to accurately and comprehensively reflect the minority perspective in the transmittal memo rather than have a separate minority report submitted to the Council. She recommended following that direction and not forwarding a separate minority report.

Commissioner Woosley agreed. Chair Bishop asked to be allowed to review the transmittal memo and the way his position gets characterized in it. She said staff would draft the memo and route it to the Commissioners for review prior to the next meeting. She said there should

be no offline meetings about it and no situations in which Commissioners reply to all, which would constitute a meeting. At the June 14 Commission meeting any discussion of this should be a formality. The Commission will also need to decide who will represent you at the June 25 Council meeting.

A motion to extend the meeting by five minutes was made by Commissioner Woosley. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marciante and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Bishop noted that the TFP and the transmittal memo was slated to go to the Council on June 25. He said the Commission would have the opportunity at the meeting on June 14 to review the final draft of the transmittal memo.

8. DRAFT MINUTES REVIEW/APPROVAL

A. April 12, 2018

A motion to table approval of the minutes to the June 14 meeting was made by Commissioner Woosley. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marciante and the motion carried unanimously.

9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

10. NEW BUSINESS – None

11. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

12. COMMISSION CALENDAR

It was noted that the June 14 meeting would be held at the South Bellevue Community Center.

13. ADJOURN

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Woosley. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lampe and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Bishop adjourned the meeting at 9:16 p.m.